



Robert Greene Sterne
Edward J. Kessler
Jorge A. Goldstein
David K.S. Cornwell
Robert W. Esmond
Tracy-Gene G. Durkin
Michele A. Cimbala
Michael B. Ray
Robert E. Sokohl
Eric K. Steffe
Michael Q. Lee
Steven R. Ludwig
John M. Covert
Linda E. Alcorn
Robert C. Millonig
Donald J. Featherstone
Timothy J. Shea, Jr
Michael V. Messinger
Judith U. Kim

Patrick E. Garrett
Jeffrey T. Helvey
Heidi L. Kraus
Eldora L. Ellison
Thomas C. Fiala
Albert L. Ferro
Donald R. Banowitz
Peter A. Jackman
Jeffrey S. Weaver
Kendrick P. Patterson
Vincent L. Capuano
Brian J. Del Buono
Virgil Lee Beaston
Theodore A. Wood
Elizabeth J. Haanes
Joseph S. Ostroff
Frank R. Cunningham
Rae Lynn P. Guest
Daniel A. Klein

Jason D. Eisenberg
Michael D. Specht
Andrea J. Kamage
Tracy L. Muller
Jon E. Wright
LuAnne M. DeSantis
Ann E. Summerfield
Aric W. Ledford
Helena C. Carlson
Cynthia M. Bouchez
Timothy A. Doyle
Gaby L. Longsworth
Lori A. Gordon
Nicole D. Detar
Ted J. Ebersole
Laura A. Vogel
Michael J. Mancuso
Bryan S. Wade
Aaron L. Schwartz

Shannon A. Carroll*
Wesley W. Jones*
Matthew E. Kelley*
Michelle K. Holoubek*
Marsha A. Rose*

Registered Patent Agents*
Karen R. Markowitz
Nancy J. Leith
Matthew J. Dowd
Katrina Yujian Pei Quach
Bryan L. Skelton
Robert A. Schwartzman
Teresa A. Colella
Victoria S. Rutherford
Simon J. Elliott
Julie A. Heider
Mita Mukherjee

Scott M. Woodhouse
Christopher J. Walsh
Liliana Di Nola-Baron
Peter A. Socarras
Jeffrey Mills

Of Counsel
Kenneth C. Bass III
Marvin C. Guthrie

*Admitted only in Maryland
+Admitted only in Virginia
•Practice Limited to
Federal Agencies

October 20, 2005

WRITER'S DIRECT NUMBER:
(202) 772-8550

INTERNET ADDRESS:
EKESSLER@SKGF.COM

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit 2145

Attn: Mail Stop Amendment

Re: U.S. Utility Patent Application
Application No. 09/989,718; Filed: November 21, 2001
For: **Improved Computer Network Architecture and Associated Method and System**
Inventors: FELTIN *et al.*
Our Ref: 1487.0310000

Sir:

Transmitted herewith for appropriate action are the following documents:

1. Request for Corrected Office Action;
2. Copy of pages 24 and 25 of Office Action dated September 28, 2005; and
3. Return postcard.

It is respectfully requested that the attached postcard be stamped with the date of filing of these documents, and that it be returned to our courier. In the event that extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this patent application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned.

Commissioner for Patents
October 20, 2005
Page 2

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency,
or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-0036.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Edward J. Kessler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,688

EJK/mhd
Enclosures

455454



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:
Feltin *et al.*
Appl. No.: 09/989,718
Filed: March 21, 2001
**For: Improved Computer Network
Architecture and Associated
Method and System**

Confirmation No.: 9575
Art Unit: 2145
Examiner: Nguyen, Minh Chau
Atty. Docket: 1487.0310000

Request for Corrected Office Action

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants, by their undersigned attorney, hereby request that the Patent and Trademark Office issue a new Office Action to correct substantive errors in the Office Action dated September 28, 2005.

Specifically, the September 28, 2005, Office Action failed to act on claim 36. Although the cover page of the Office Action stated that claim 36 was rejected, no specific ground of rejection of that claim was set forth in the body of the Office Action. Applicants are therefore unable to properly and fully respond to the Office Action. It is further noted that the Examiner erroneously acted on claim 15 which had been previously canceled by the Amendment and Reply filed May 6, 2005.

Finally, at pages 24-25 of the Office Action, it appears that some text is missing. A photocopy of the affected pages is attached for convenient reference.

In light of the foregoing errors, it is respectfully requested that the PTO issue a corrected Office Action and that the period for response be reset to run from the date of mailing of the corrected Action.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Request is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward J. Kessler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,688

Date: 10 Oct. 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

455326_1.DOC

75. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozzie et al. (Ozzie) (US 6,640,241 1311) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Lehmann-Haupt et al. (Lehmann-Haupt) (US 2002!0107786 A1).

76. Regarding claim 35, Ozzie fails to teach a network has statistical attributes which indicate characteristics of the link such as usability or popularity. However, Ozzie teaches the network has updating status online/offline of devices which indicate of the usability. Lehmann-Haupt teaches a method as claimed in claim 35 wherein the links constitute a neural network having statistical attributes which indicate characteristics of the link such as usability, popularity or the like (Col. 2, paragraph [018]-[022]). Thus, it would have been obvious to have a statistical attributes that indicate characteristic of popularity, as suggested of Lehmann-Haupt, in method and apparatus for activity based collaboration by a computer system equipped with a communications manager of Ozzie, in order having advantage of existing business relationships among parties in a network of computers.

Response to Arguments

77. Applicant's arguments filed 5/6/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

discloses a computing device wherein said device is adapted to perform a supervisory and/or supporting role in relation to peers in a peer-to-peer network, the method including the steps of: a. the computing device establishing contact with a plurality of peers which are to be the subject of the supervision and/or support role (Col. 17, L. 46-48); and b. providing said supervision and/or support (Col. 17, L. 58-62).

Conclusion

79. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.